

3. It is to be remarked that the operations in Ránder were undertaken after the plan of survey and enquiry had been fully matured and tested, and after both the Survey and Enquiry Officers had had great practical experience in Surat not only in the ordinary routine work, but in the administration of the rules and preparation of the records. This will in some measure account for the work in Ránder having been completed more rapidly in proportion than in other towns and cities, where the operations were commenced before the officers employed understood fully the magnitude of the work, and before the inhabitants had become aware that a minute survey and record of rights adds considerably to the value of town property, both public and private.

4. There is no doubt that the Municipality and the inhabitants of towns generally are fully alive to the value and importance of a survey, and it would appear that, as a financial measure, a survey is more profitable in proportion in small towns than in large cities.

(Signed) C. J. PRESCOTT,  
Superintendent, Revenue Survey and Assessment, Gajráť.

No. 2235 OF 1873.

To  
THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,  
Revenue Department, Bombay.

*Matheran, 13th May 1873.*

SIR,

I have the honour to forward a report by Mr. Hope on the completion of the Ránder City Survey. It No. 713 of 12th March 1873, with accompani- has been done in a comparatively short space of time owing, perhaps, chiefly to the greater ease and facility with which Mr. Carey, who was the Enquiry Officer, was able to work after the considerable experience he had gained in Surat and Balsár.

2. If the cost of the Enquiry Officer is included in the calculation, the financial result of the survey on the 1st March shows a loss of Rs. 2,362. If it is excluded, as Mr. Hope contends it should be, it shows a gain of near Rs. 1,600. A good deal may be said on both sides of the question, whether this item should be included or excluded. On behalf of excluding it is urged the fact that, if the officer was not employed on that particular work, he would be employed in some other department, and

the cost to Government would be the same. But it is manifest that by following out this principle it could be shown that the cost of the Covenanted Officers in the Revenue and the Judicial Departments is nil. It could be said, Government bring out a certain number of civilians for the general business of the country, some of them are employed in the Revenue Department, others in the Judicial, and others in Miscellaneous Departments, but as they would have to be paid their salaries, no matter in what department they worked, the department in which they may happen to be should not be charged with their salaries, and, *ergo*, the cost of that department is nil so far as covenanted supervision is concerned. But as Mr. Hope says Government have consented to exclude this item the Ránder survey shows a profit, as I have said, of Rs. 1,600.

3. The proceeds of land sales appear to have been held in deposit pending settlement of the question whether they should be entirely appropriated by the Municipality or a part should be assigned to Government. In all towns in which City Surveys are in progress these proceeds are taken entirely by the Municipality, and they are in fact the consideration on which Municipalities have been induced to undertake the cost of the survey. But in some towns, as at Ahmadabad, where the returns from the survey are distant, Government have consented to pay a part of the establishment. Mr. Carey proposes that the usual rule should be followed, but Mr. Hope considers that Government should take one-fourth of the sale proceeds. There appear to be two ways of settling this question. Government may charge the whole cost of the survey, including the cost of the Enquiry Officer, to the Municipality, and reserving to itself the two-pie rental on every square yard, leave all other proceeds to be taken by the Municipality, or, as Mr. Hope suggests, take as much from the sale proceeds of land as will fairly remunerate Government for the expense to which they have been put. In the former case Government would, at no expenditure whatever, obtain a present annual rent of Rs. 12-14-6, and a further prospective rent of Rs. 456-10-10 per annum on the 43,841 square yards available for lease on terms of 99 years. In the latter case Government would bear the charge of the Enquiry Officer and establishment which it has already paid, Rs. 4,298-1-2, and over and above the two-pie rental, which belong to Government under the original conditions of the establishment of City Survey, receive from the Municipality a sufficient interest on this sum from the proceeds of land sales.

4. Mr. Hope points out that if Government take one-fourth of the proceeds of land sales they will eventually receive Rs. 13,343, and it must be obvious that to receive that sum in return for an expenditure of Rs. 4,298, is to drive rather a hard bargain with the

Municipality. I would therefore suggest that the Municipality be required to repay Government the above sum of Rs. 4,298, with interest at 5 per cent. in six instalments, at intervals of six months, and let the Municipality take the whole of the sale proceeds, sanad fees, &c., with the exception of the two-pie rental. I propose a term of three years for the recovery of the above sum to let the Municipality meet the instalments, as far as possible, from City Survey Receipts.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

(Signed) L. R. ASHBURNER,  
Revenue Commissioner, N. D.

---

No. 1420 of 1873.

To

L. R. ASHBURNER, Esq., C.S.I.,  
Revenue Commissioner, N.D.

*Surat Collector's Camp, Teethul, 29th May 1873.*

SIR,

I have had the honour to receive the copy of your letter to Government, No. 2235, of 13th instant, regarding the Rander Survey, and although it has been sent to me for the special purpose of being printed, I trust that you will excuse my making the following remarks.

2. I have never in any correspondence advocated the exclusion of the pay of the Enquiry Officer on the grounds stated in para. 2, which obviously produce a *reductio ad absurdum*. What I have said was that Government having at a particular time happened, by miscalculation, to bring out a much larger number of civilians than was really required for the general business of the country, such *extra* civilians must be paid, whether they worked or did nothing (as actually happened in some cases), and that, therefore, their employment as Enquiry Officers was not an actual extra charge arising from such work which Government could justly set off against cash expenditure by Municipalities in an adjustment of account.